# Title II Project Application Roseburg District Resource Advisory Committee

1. Project Number (Assigned by federal unit):

2. Project Name: Nickerson Road Improvem	nent 3. County: Douglas	3. County: Douglas		
4. Project Sponsor: BLM (Pete Howe)	<b>5. Date:</b> 07/03/01			
6. Sponsor's Phone Number: 541-440-4930				
7. Sponsors E-mail:				
8. Project Location (attach project area map)				
a. 4 <sup>th</sup> Field Watershed Name and HUC #(if known):				
b. 5 <sup>th</sup> Field Watershed Name and HUC #(if known): Upper Smith				
c. Legal Location: Township 21 Range 6 Section(s) 9 (See map for more details)				
<b>Description:</b> 20-6-9.0 Road				
d. BLM District Roseburg e. BLM Resource Area Swiftwater				
f. National Forest g. Forest Service District				
h. State / Private / Other lands involved? □ Yes 🛛 No				

### 9. Statement of Project Goals and Objectives:

Continue with Smith River Watershed Restoration, which has been ongoing since 1995. BLM, Seneca Timber Company, Douglas County, and Umpqua Water Basin Watershed Council have completed approximately 25 fish passage culvert replacements, approximately 21 miles of road decommissioning, stream structure placements, and approximately 6.5 miles of road improvement since 1995 and this project would be a continuation of the watershed restoration plans which addresses water quality, fish passage, and spawning and rearing habitat restoration.

### 10. Project Description: (Provide concise description of project and attach map.)

This project would reduce the sedimentation getting into Nickerson Creek and Smith River by removing failing sidecast material, replacing all existing culverts, installing additional new culverts as needed, surfacing the old sandstone subgrade, and removal of small cutbank failures.

11. Coordination of this project with other related project(s) on adjacent lands?			
□ Yes	$\boxtimes$ N <sub>0</sub>	If yes, then describe	

# Title II Project Application Roseburg District Resource Advisory Committee

12. How does proposed project meet purposes of the Legislation? [Sec. 203(b)(1)]				
<b>Improves maintenance of existing infrastructure.</b> [Sec. 2(b)]				
<b>Implements stewardship objectives that enhance forest ecosystems.</b> [Sec. 2(b)]				
<b>⊠</b> Restores and improves land health. [Sec. 2(b)]				
<b>⊠</b> Restores water quality. [Sec. 2(b)]				
13. Project Type (check one) [Sec. 203(b)(1)]				
<b>⊠</b> Road Maintenance [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]	☐ Trail Maintenance [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]			
☐ Road Decommission/Obliteration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]				
☐ Other Infrastructure Maintenance (specify): [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]				
☐ Soil Productivity Improvement [Sec. 2(b)(2)(B)]	☐ Forest Health Improvement [Sec. 2(b)(2)(C)]			
<b>☑</b> Watershed Restoration & Mntc. [Sec. 2(b)(2)(D)]	☐ Wildlife Habitat Restoration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(E)]			
☐ Fish Habitat Restoration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(E)]	☑ Control of Noxious Weeds [Sec. 2(b)(2)(F)]			
☐ Reestablish Native Species [Sec. 2(b)(2)(G)]				
□ Other Project Type (specify) [Sec. 2(b)(2)]:				
14. Measure of Project Accomplishments/Expected Outcomes [Sec. 203(b)(5)]				
	b. Total Miles: 0.9			
	d. Est. People Reached (for environmental education			
e. No. Laborer Days:	projects):			
f. Other (specify):				

## Title II Project Application Roseburg District Resource Advisory Committee

### 15. Duration of Project and Estimated Completion Date: [Sec. 203(b)(2)]

### 16. Target Species Benefitted: (if applicable)

Coho Salmon, Chinook, Cutthroat Trout, and Steelhead are present all or part of the year in Nickerson Creek and Smith River. Coho Salmon is currently listed under the ESA as a threatened species and Steelhead are a candidate species for listing.

### 17. How will cooperative relationships among people that use federal lands be improved? [Sec. 2(b)(3)]

BLM and Seneca Timber Company will have a much improved all weather access to their lands for management purposes and hunting and other recreational will be improved.

# **18.** How is this project in the best public interest? [Sec. 203(b)(7)] Identify benefits to communities. The project will improve water quality by eliminating the sediment getting into Nickerson Creek and Smith River from this road system. The project would also benefit the local communities by providing jobs since local contractors will be used for the improvement work.

### 19. How does project benefit federal lands/resources?

This project will help enable BLM to meet Oregon State Water quality standards as required by federal law by eliminating the sedimentation that is currently being placed into Nickerson Creek and Smith River that is listed as a TIER 1 Watershed by the Forest Ecosystem Assessment Team and Essential Salmon Habitat By the National Marine Fisheries Service by this road during periods of wet weather.

20. Status of Project Planning			
a. NEPA Complete:	⊠ Yes	□ No	
If no, give est. date of completion:			
c. NMFS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete:	⊠ Yes	□ No	
d. USFWS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete:	⊠ Yes	□ No	
e. Survey & Manage Complete:	□ Yes	□ No	<b>☑</b> Not Applicable
f. DSL/ODFW* Permits for In-stream Work Obtained:	□ Yes	□ No	<b>☑</b> Not Applicable
g. DSL/COE* 404 Fill/Removal Permit Obtained:	□ Yes	□ No	<b>☑</b> Not Applicable
h. SHPO* Concurrence Received:	□ Yes	□ No	<b>☑</b> Not Applicable
i. Project Design(s) Completed:	□ Yes	⊠ No	
* DSL = Dept. of State Lands, ODFW = Oregon Dept. of Fish and Wildlife, COE = Army Corps of Engineers,			

SHPO = State Historic Preservation Officer

# Title II Project Application Roseburg District Resource Advisory Committee

21. Proposed Method(s) of Accomplishment	
<b>⊠</b> Contract	□ Federal Workforce
□ County Workforce	□ Volunteers
☐ Other (specify):	
22. Will the Project Generate Merchantable M  ☐ Yes ☐ No	<b>//aterials?</b> [Sec. 204(e)(3)]
23. Anticipated Project Costs [Sec. 203(b)(3)]	
a. Total County Title II Funds Requested: \$10	09,600.00
b. Is this a multi-year funding request? ☐ Yes	No If yes, then display by fiscal year
c. FY02 Request: \$109,600.00	f. FY05 Request:
d. FY03 Request:	g. FY06 Request:
e. FY04 Request:	

# Title II Project Application Roseburg District Resource Advisory Committee

**Table 1. Project Cost Analysis** 

Item	Column A Fed. Agency Appropriated Contribution [Sec. 203(b)(4)]	Column B Requested County Title II Contribution [Sec. 203(b)(4)]	Column C Other Contributions [Sec. 203(b)(4)]	Column D Total Available Funds
24. Field Work & Site Surveys		\$1,000.00		
25. NEPA & Sec. 7 ESA		\$750.00		
Consultation				
26. Permit Acquisition				
27. Project Design & Engineering		\$2,500.00		
28. Contract Preparation		\$1,850.00		
29. Contract Administration		\$2,500.00		
30. Contract Cost		\$100,000.00		
31. Workforce Cost				
32. Materials & Supplies				
33. Monitoring		\$1,000.00		
34. Other				
35. Project Sub-Total				
36. Indirect Costs (Overhead)				
(per year for multi-year projects)				
37. Total Cost Estimate		\$109,600.00		

38. Identify Source(s) of Other Funding for Project Identified Above [Sec. 203(b)(4)]

# Title II Project Application Roseburg District Resource Advisory Committee

### 39. Monitoring Plan [Sec. 203(b)(6)]

a. What measures or evaluations will be made to determine how well the proposed project meets the desired ecological conditions? [Sec. 203(b)(6)] Who will be responsible for this monitoring item?

All new structures and improvements will be monitored during and after construction to ensure that it was constructed to: minimize the diversion of natural hydrologic flow paths, protect fish and wildlife populations, and reduce the amount of sediment delivery into streams. The Contracting Officer's Representative and Project Inspector will be responsible for monitoring water quality during the contract and a BLM Hydrologist will do monitoring the first year after the contract is completed.

b. How will the project be evaluated to determine how well the proposed project contributes towards local employment and/or training opportunities, including summer youth jobs programs such as the Youth Conservation Corps? [Sec. 203(b)(6)] Who will be responsible for this monitoring item?

The project implementation will be accomplished via contract with local companies. The Contracting Officers Representative will report the number of person days used to complete this project. No further evaluation is planned.

c. What methods and measures of evaluation will be established to determine how well the proposed project improves the use of, or added value to, any products removed from federal lands consistent with the purposes of this Act? [Sec. 203(b)(6) and Sec. 204(e)(3)] Who will be responsible for this monitoring item?

This project will not remove any merchantable material.

d. Identify total funding needed to carry out specified monitoring tasks (Table 1, item 33):

Monitoring cost will be negligible, estimated to be a onetime cost of approximately \$1,000.00 for BLM labor.